

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

February 17, 1999 LB 461

about the openness with which Nebraska requires meetings of public entities and bodies to be conducted. We, to a greater and greater extent, not for the convenience of the public, but for the convenience of these officials, are making it easier and easier to shut the public out. This bill, as Senator Cudaback pointed out, is tailgating on what the law already allows with reference to this videoconferencing. I don't know and I'm not convinced that nibbling away in this manner is good. Senator Cudaback, the reason all of this would not be offered at one time is it was too big a lump for the Legislature to swallow. It would have been clear that the goal is not to serve the public, but to serve the convenience of these officials. Naturally, if that's what a majority of the Legislature wants to do, they will get it done. This is not one of those stop the music, or stop the whole show bills, as far as I'm concerned. I will not offer amendments at this stage of debate. I will not extend debate to try to impede the movement of the bill, however I'm not going to vote for it at this point.

**SPEAKER KRISTENSEN:** Debate on the Chambers amendment to the committee amendment? Senator Cudaback.

**SENATOR CUDABACK:** Mr. Speaker and members, I support the committee amendment, and I support Senator Chambers' amendment to take that word out. And if there's a chance that a group might not hold it in a building of reasonable definition, why I will support the public building. I mean I don't think...I want to make it perfectly clear here the intent of this bill is not to shut the people out, and I just want to make that again for the record. If it does, why we'll...we'll make a recommendation to change that the next time around. So thank you.

**SPEAKER KRISTENSEN:** Senator Schimek.

**SENATOR SCHIMEK:** Yes, thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. Senator Chambers, I, too, will support it, but I liked your original idea better. I liked your original idea which would say "buildings which are used to accommodate the public", I liked that better just because I think in some of these smaller communities public buildings may be harder to find that are suitable. But, nevertheless, I will go along with the amendment as well.